

throne" is mankind's heart, etc., etc., etc. Thus at least one book in the Bible, "The Revelation of Jesus Christ," has become an inextricable tangle and confusion of words, in fact, a gigantic riddle defying solution. And yet, the Holy Ghost calls it a "revelation!"

That there are figures, types, metaphors, signs, symbols and "visions" in the Word of God, no one will for a moment deny. But we contend that when such is the case, it is so stated in the Word. For instance, in John 7:38, Jesus says: "He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." We may say it does not stand to reason that this is to be taken literally. "Absurd!" we cry. But the Word of God does not leave it for our reason to decide whether it is to be taken spiritually or literally. "But this spake he of the Spirit, etc." Hence, not to be taken literally, we are informed of the fact. In the prophecy in Rev. 12, we have a woman, "travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered," while standing before her is a dragon, ready "for to devour her child as soon as it was born." "Symbolic," you say. But it is not for you, but the Word, itself, to say, "And a great sign was seen in the heaven; a woman, etc.," (R. V.) When we wade into the mysteries of the revelation of God, we must depend on that revelation and not on reason, for truth.

We should like to know what the spiritualizers had to say when the prophet declared, seven centuries before Christ, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son." We can almost hear them say, "Literal? No, no! Impossible! A figurative expression! Symbolic language! If there is conception, there is no longer virginity!" And any one who would have been bold enough to contend for a literal interpretation of such a scripture would then as now, have been catalogued as an ignoramus. Nevertheless, a virgin *did* conceive! A virgin *did* bear a son! Yes, a *literal* virgin brought forth a *literal* son! Human reason may well pause where divine revelation begins.

We condemn the Jew for rejecting Christ who so literally fulfilled the prophecies concerning the Messiah; then, why should we be so inconsistent as to refuse to accept as literally the words of the prophets concerning the Second Coming of Christ? For instance, if you believe Luke 1:31, to be literally true, why not so believe verses 32 and 33, immediately following?

"31. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus.

"32. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father, David.

"33. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

The following is an account of a conver-

sation between a Christian minister and a Jew, on the above quoted passage.

"Taking a New Testament and opening it at Luke 1:32, the Jew asked: 'Do you believe that what is here written shall be literally accomplished,—The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father, David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever? 'I do not,' answered the clergyman, 'but rather take it to be figurative language, descriptive of Christ's spiritual reign over the church.'

'Then,' replied the Jew, 'neither do I believe literally the words preceding, which say that this Son of David should be born of a virgin: but take them to be merely a figurative manner of describing the remarkable character for purity of him who is the subject of prophecy.' 'But why' continued the Jew, 'do you refuse to believe literally verses 32 and 33, when you believe implicitly the far more incredible statement of verse 31?'

'I believe it,' replied the clergyman, 'because it is a fact.' 'Ah!' exclaimed the Jew, with an inexpressible air of scorn and triumph, 'you believe the Scripture because it is a fact; I believe it because it is the Word of God!'" Amen!

Philadelphia, Pa.

#### THE GRACE OF GIVING

L. W. DITCH

Mr. Fair. Good evening Brother Hope. Glad to find you at home. Thought I would come to spend the evening with you.

Mr. Hope. I am pleased that you have come. I have been searching the Scriptures relative to the subject our pastor preached upon last Lord's day.

Mr. F. That was a good sermon on giving.

Mr. H. I was not thinking so much about the sermon as of one or two statements he made. One was, "Giving is an act of worship" and the other was, "Grace is bestowed thru giving."

Mr. F. I did not listen very attentively. About all one hears at church these days is give. I am weary of this cry for money.

Mr. H. Why Brother Fair! you surprise me. Do you expect the church to prosecute her mission without money?

Mr. F. Well, no. It takes so much now days.

Mr. H. Does it not take more to run your business now than years ago?

Mr. F. Yes, that is because my business is increasing.

Mr. H. That is, you mean large investments bring larger gains. The church can succeed upon no other principle. Yet many people think the church today should do (her) its work upon the same amount of capital it did thirty years ago.

Mr. F. But why must there be so much begging?

Mr. H. Because a large per cent of

church members do not believe the two truths our pastor so impressed upon me.

Mr. F. Do you mean that giving is a part of worship the same as singing, praying or reading the Bible?

Mr. H. I do. Moreover I believe it is a means of grace and the person who omits compliance with God's will in this matter is no better spiritually than the one who omits footwashing.

Mr. F. But footwashing is a command.

Mr. H. I am sure that giving is more commanded than singing, yet you do not seem to object to singing in our worship. With your permission I will read some of the scriptures I have marked upon this subject.

Mr. F. I shall be pleased to hear.

Mr. H. In Luke 20:25 I read, "render unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's and unto God the things which be God's." This reads much like a command.

Mr. F. It does. But I think it means spiritually.

Mr. H. That is true in some sense but Jesus is talking about tribute or tax and I believe he means just what he said and that is that we should pay a tax to God as well as to the government. Think how much begging this government would have to do if nobody paid tax but those who felt like it and then only what they pleased. If Christians would pay as Christ here directs there would be no begging. Strange we should be afraid of the sheriff and not afraid of God.

Mr. F. You are right. But a few must bear all the burden.

Mr. H. For the reason that a large per cent of church people are ignorant of what God requires or else are willingly disobedient. Such conduct is most sinful. Here in I Cor. 6:19, 20, I have another mark. "Ye are not your own for ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your bodies and in your spirits which are God's." Does it not seem as if the writer should have added, and glorify God with your worldly possessions which are also God's.

Mr. F. I am greatly impressed. Never thought that God had anything to do with my possessions. If I remember correctly it is said of the church at Jerusalem, "no one said that ought of the things he possessed was his own." I see now it was his Lord's and should be used for such purposes as would add to the progress of the church and the good of its members. Still I do not see how it becomes an act of worship.

Mr. H. I was reading when you came I Cor. 16:2. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." This is plain instructions as to who, when and how to give. When? "the first day." Why not the second day?

Mr. F. I do not know.

Mr. H. Because the apostolic churches met for worship on the first day. By setting this day for the collection Paul makes it a part of that first day service and for that